UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,236	02/28/2006	Pieter Van Der Wolf	NL031032	2510

24737   7590   05/06/2010
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
GIARDINO JR, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/06/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/570,236	VAN DER WOLF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARK A. GIARDINO JR	2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 February 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7,9,11-13 and 15_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7, 9, 11-13, and 15_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The Examiner acknowledges the applicant's submission of the amendment dated 2/8/2010. At this point claim 1 has been amended. Thus, claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, and 15 are pending in the instant application.

The instant application having Application No. 10/570,236 has a total of 12 claims pending in the application, there is 1 independent claim and 11 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

INFORMATION CONCERNING OATH/DECLARATION

Oath/Declaration

The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. ' 1.63**.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sindhu (5,440,698) in view of Foster (US 6,202,097) and Denneau (US 2003/0028747).

Regarding Claim 1, Sindhu teaches a data processing system, comprising:

memory device **(main memory 13 of Figure 1)** and a plurality of data

processors **(processors 12 of Figure 1)** accessing said memory device **(the memory**

is connected to global bus and thus can be accessed from the processors,

Column 5 Lines 28-45),

a communication interface **(controllers 21 and busses 15)** coupled between

said memory device and said plurality of data processors and at least one local memory

unit **(local memory RAM 19 of Figure 1)**, said communication interface including a

network of nodes **(node 14 of Figure 1 in Sindhu)** and a memory interface **(interface**

on controllers 21 to main memory controller 25 and arbiter 36), each node

comprising at least one slave port for receiving a memory access request from a data

processor or from a previous node **(connections from the processor cache 16 to the**

bus 15) and at least one master port **(connection from controller 21 to bus 26)** for

issuing a memory access request to a next node or to said memory device in

accordance with the memory access request received at said slave port, or to one of

said data processors **(processors 12)**, and one or more said master ports **(connection**

from controller 21 to bus 26) are connected to the memory interface, wherein the

memory interface arbitrates access to the memory device and said at least one local

memory unit **(Column 6 Lines 23-38 and Column 23 Lines 1-54)**; and

a cache controller, contained within at least one of said nodes, for controlling at

least a section of the local memory unit as a cache memory **(a cache controller 21**

controls control local memory 19, Column 4 Lines 30-54, specifically the last

sentence, and local memory 19 is explicitly referred to as a cache memory,

Column 4 Lines 45-51), wherein at least a part of the local memory unit is used to

locally store a copy of data residing in other local memories reachable via one of its

master ports **(all local memories 19 may store data from any other memory, thus a**

local memory unit may store data from other local memory units, Column 16

Lines 44-50, and all data is accessible via the master port as all data going into or

out of node 14 must go through controller 21 as shown on Figure 1).

However, Sindhu does not teach physical location of the communication interface

(comprising controllers 21, busses 15, and arbiter 36) in relation to the global

memory **(main memory 13)**, thus it is unknown if the communication interface is

positioned on a single chip, wherein the memory device is not positioned on the single

chip. Foster (US 6,634,034) teaches a communication interface **(arbiter 36 in Foster)**

on a separate chip than the memory **(global memory 26 in Foster, also see Column 5**

Lines 37-43 and Figure 2, the memory device is on an entirely separate card).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to which the subject matter pertains to have positioned the

communication interface on a single chip, since many processors do not contain a node

(such as controllers 21 in Sindhu) and adding these controllers on the chip with the

arbiter would allow the device to work with a wide range of processors, not just ones

with controllers **(note in Figure 4B in Foster how the processor node has no**

controller to access the arbiter; the controlling is done by arbiter 36) . Keeping the

memory on a separate chip **(contained on the memory cards 26 in Foster)** allows for

greater flexibility, since one may choose to add cards with less RAM for a less

expensive system or cards with more RAM for a higher performance system **(Column 5**

5 Lines 6-19 in Foster). So, by combining the devices, additional benefits are

obtained.

Also, neither Sindhu nor Foster teaches the ability to selectively access a

memory request using an address range within a single address space to distinguish

between the local cache and main memory. Denneau et al (US 2003/0028747) teaches

at least one local memory unit **(cache network 180 of Figure 1)** associated with a

corresponding plurality of data processors **(Processors 140 of Figure 1)**, said local

memory unit adapted to be selectively accessed by a memory request of said

corresponding data processors, wherein said memory device and said local memory

unit have a single address space and an address range within said single address

space **(see Figure 3, where the "area used primarily by P0 and P1" and the**

separate processor stacks have a different address than the other local

memories, also see how certain data is cached in the cache dedicated to each

processor, each cache with its own addressed range, Paragraph 0041).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to which the subject matter pertains to have used the caches

and memory in Denneau **(including the separate address range feature)** for the

caches and local memory of a node 14 in Sindhu, because of the additional flexibility

provided **(second half of Paragraph 0008 in Denneau)**.

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 2, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, wherein at each node the number of said slave ports is higher than the number of said master ports (see Figure 1 in Sindhu, where each node has at least two slave ports and at most one master port).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 3, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 2, characterized in that said network of nodes is hierarchically structured (see Figure 1 in Sindhu, where three child nodes connect to one parent node, implying a hierarchy; also discussion of hierarchy on Column 5 Lines 14-19).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 4, Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 3, wherein said network of nodes is arranged in a directed acyclic graph structure (see Figure 1 in Sindhu where the master ports of the node containing controllers 21 are connected to slave port of node containing bus 26; note that bus requests branch from nearest the processor at the cache level to farthest from the processor at main memory, rendering the graph directed, also see description of interconnection on Column 5 Lines 28-45).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 5, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 4, wherein said network of nodes is arranged in a tree structure (see Figure 1 in Sindhu, where the child and parent nodes are arranged in a tree structure; also discussion of the tree structure in Column 5 first full paragraph).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 6, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, and Sindhu further teaches wherein said network of nodes include n groups of nodes with n >= 2 (see Figure 1, where n = 2), wherein each of the slave ports of the nodes of a first group (nodes containing busses 15) is connected to one of said plurality of data processors (processors containing caches 16), the master ports of the nodes of the nth group (nodes containing controllers 21) are coupled to said memory device (memory means containing controller 25 and main memory 13), and each of the slave ports of the nodes of the nth group is connected to a master port of the nodes of the $(n-1)^{th}$ group (the master port of the nodes containing busses 15 are connected to the slave port of the nodes containing controllers 21).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 7, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, and Sindhu further teaches wherein said nodes are hubs (nodes containing busses 15 as well as node containing bus 26).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 9, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, and Sindhu further teaches wherein at least one node means further comprises at least one memory port to which a local memory unit is connected (see the port connecting RAMs 19 to controllers 21).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 11, since Sindhu, Foster, and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, and Sindhu

further teaches wherein said communication interface further includes at least one

synchronization means for streaming communication between data processors (arbiters

35 are such a synchronization means, see description of this device in the last

paragraph of Column 7).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 12, since Sindhu, Foster,

and Denneau teach the data processing means according to claim 11, and Sindhu

further teaches wherein at least one node includes said synchronization means for

streaming communication between the data processors means directly or indirectly

coupled to said nodes (arbiters 35 are indirectly coupled to the node means through

caches 16, see Figure 1).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 13, since Sindhu, Foster,

and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 11, and Sindhu

further teaches wherein the local memory unit is configured to provide storage based on

a first-in/first-out function (which is well known in the art; see US 2002/0188811

Paragraph 0008) and said synchronization means comprises a first-in/first-out

administration means for controlling said local memory unit (the arbiter uses an

algorithm that includes FIFO, see Column 8 Lines 18-24).

The combined device teaches all limitations of Claim 15, since Sindhu, Foster,

and Denneau teach the data processing system according to claim 1, and Sindhu

further teaches wherein at least a portion of said plurality of data processors means is

positioned on said single chip (providing circuitry on a chip is well known in the art).

ARGUMENTS CONCERNING NON-PRIOR ART REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Rejections - USC 112

Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to claim 1 has been considered and has overcome the Examiner's prior rejections and thus are withdrawn.

ARGUMENTS CONCERNING PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejections - USC 102/103

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 that "Sindhu fails to disclose the element of utilizing a portion of the local memory as a cache memory" has been considered but is not persuasive. The claim specifically recites "controlling at least a section of the local memory unit as a cache memory". As local memory 19 is explicitly referred to as a cache memory on Column 4 Lines 45-51 of Sindhu, at least a portion of the local memory is controlled as a cache memory.

Applicant's argument that Sindhu does not disclose the claim element "locally store a copy of data residing in other local memories reachable via a corresponding master port" has been considered but is not persuasive. Though Sindhu does not explicitly teach cache memory 16 or local memory 19 sharing data, Sindhu at least teaches sharing data among each local memory 19. One of ordinary skill in the art would realize there would be no need for a broadcast write (described in Column 16 Lines 44-52 of Sindhu) if only one copy of any data was kept in any of the local memories 19. And, as the local memories 19 are referred to as "cache memories" at

least on Column 4 Lines 30-54 (specifically the last two sentences), and as controller

21a has been construed by the examiner as the "master port" of the node (as all data

going into or out of node 14 must go through controller 21 on Figure 1), local memory

19a reaches other local memories via master port 21a. Thus, the limitation of "locally

store a copy of data residing in other local memories reachable via a corresponding

master port" is satisfied.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the

application as recommended by **M.P.E.P. ' 707.07(i)**:

CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION

Per the instant office action, claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, and 15 have received a second action on the merits and are subject of a second action final.

DIRECTION OF FUTURE CORRESPONDENCES

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Anthony Giardino whose telephone number is (571) 270-3565 and can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Sanjiv Shah can be reached on (571) 272 - 4098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.A. Giardino   /Stephen Elmore/
                                                         Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2185
/M.G./

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2185

May 6, 2010